



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,392	01/19/2001	Masato Nakajima	24500	7547

20529 7590 07/01/2005

NATH & ASSOCIATES
1030 15th STREET, NW
6TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

AHMED, SAMIR ANWAR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/764,392

Applicant(s)

NAKAJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Samir A. Ahmed

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10 and 12-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/03/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' amendment filed March 25, 2005, has been entered and made of record.
2. In response to applicant's amendment, the rejection of claims 1, 9, 14, 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph have been withdrawn.
4. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combined teachings of Kamada et al (U.S. 6,466,694), Kazuyuki et al (EP 0 587 450) and Wang et al. (U.S. 6,512,848).

As to claim 1, Kamada disclose a document modification apparatus for modifying image data read by image input means, comprising:

region extracting means for extracting a plurality of regions from the image data, each being a unit to be modified (Figure 1A, Region Identifying Unit 2; Figure 2, Extracting Unit 15, Identifying Unit 11; Column 5, Lines 1-46; Column 6, Lines 49-61).

region selection means for selecting target regions to be modified from the plurality of regions through an operator (Abstract; Figures 2-4; Column 5, Lines 31-40;

Art Unit: 2623

Column 6, Lines 62-67, Column 7, Lines 1-10; Column 7, Lines 41-67, Column 8, Lines 1-11 ; Column 10, Lines 10-18);

modification specifying means for specifying kinds of modifications for the target regions selected by the region selection means through the operator (Figures 2-4; Column 7, Lines 41-67, Column 8, Lines 1-11); and

modification image making means for making a modified image, based on the kinds of the modifications, in the regions in the image data selected by the region selection means, specified by the modification specifying means (Figures 2-4; Column 9, Lines 36-67, Column 10, Lines 1-18);

wherein the region extracting means extracts rectangle regions as the target regions to be modified, and the region extracting means comprises a first judgment means for judging whether an attribute of the rectangle region is one of a "character" and "ruled-line" and "others" (Figure 2, Identifying Unit 11; Column 5, Lines 1-2; Figure 3-14; Column 6, Lines 49-67, Column 7, Lines 1-10; Column 10, Lines 25-67, Column 4 1, Lines 1-24), and a second judgment means for judging whether the attribute of the rectangle region is one of "table" "photograph" and a "frame" (Figure 2, Recognizing 12; Column 5, Lines 3-4; Figure 3-14; Column 6, Lines 49-67, Column 7, Lines 1-10; Column 10, Lines 25-67, Column 11, Lines 1-24).

Kamada does not specifically disclose the judgment for identifying details of process performed by second judgment means; and operation of the second judgment means being based on whether the first judgment means identifies the attribute as "others".

Kazuyuki et al, in the same field of endeavor concerning identifying and categorizing different portions of an input document image as being "character", "ruled-line", "table", "photograph", or the like, disclose a document image processing system comprising projecting means for taking a projection data in vertical and horizontal directions of the extracted rectangle regions to judge the attribute of the rectangle region, whose attributes has not been judged to be "character" or "ruled line", is one of a "table", "photograph" and a "frame" according to a number of peaks detected from the projection data (Figures 8, 18, 19 and 21; Columns 10, 16 and 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teachings of Kamada et al and Kazuyuki et al to identify different portion of a document image using a projection analyzing method in the vertical and horizontal directions because it is a conventional technique routinely implemented in the art (Kazuyuki et al, Column 1, Lines 22-34, as disclosed in JP-A-1-1 5889). This Conventional methodology will result in more accurate and reliable categorization of document image content. Neither Kamada nor Kazuyuki discloses, operation of the second judgment means being based on whether the first judgment means identifies the attribute as "others".

Wang discloses an apparatus for identifying and classifying different portions of an input document image in a page analysis system including a means (first judgment means) to determine whether an attribute of a rectangle region is text data "characters" (Fig. 6, S606 col. 5, lines 10-24, Fig. 1, items 3,4,5,6) or Non-text data (horizontal, vertical, dotted or slanted line) "ruled line (Fig. 6, S 609, col. 5, lines 25-29) or the block

Art Unit: 2623

of image cannot be identified as either text "character" or as non-text "ruled line", the block is determined as "unknown" (others) (Fig. 6, S 611) and an OCR processing technique (second judgment means) is used to determine the type of the unknown "others" block. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wang's teachings to modify the combined apparatus of Kamada and Kazuyuki by using a second judgment means to classify the attribute of a rectangle region judged by a first judgment means as "unknown" (others) in order to increase the accuracy of image data classification in a page analysis system for analyzing image data of a document page (col. 3, lines 3-6).

As to claims 4-5, 7, refer to claim 4-5, 7 rejections. The grounds for rejections stated in paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed on 12/27/04, are incorporated by reference herein.

As to claim 14, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 1 are applicable to claim 14. Kamada et al further disclose image output means for outputting the modified image obtained by the document modification apparatus (Figure 3A, Displaying Unit 25).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combined teachings of Kamada et al (U.S. 6,466,694), Kazuyuki et al (EP 0 587 450) and Wang et al. (U.S. 6,512,848) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Koga et al. (U.S. 5,717,794).

Kamada, Kazuyuki, and Wang do not explicitly disclose further limitations of claim 6.

Koga et al disclose a document recognition and editing system, comprising a modification specifying means which displays an at-a-glance menu showing information regarding kinds of modifications, and selects the modification, to be applied to the selected rectangle regions, from the kinds of the modifications shown in the at-a-glance menu through the operator (Figures 15 and 17; Column 15, lines 12-20; Column 16, Lines 13-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined apparatus of Kamada et al, Kazuyuki et al and Wang et al. according to the teachings of Koga et al to implement further limitations recited in Claim 6 because it will expedite document modification process and will minimize processing error.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combined teachings of Kamada et al (U.S. 6,466,694), Kazuyuki et al (EP 0 587 450) and Wang et al. (U.S. 6,512,848) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Tabata et al. (U.S. 4,785,296).

Kamada, Kazuyuki, and Wang do not explicitly disclose further limitations of claim 8.

Tabata et al disclose a document modification method and system for displaying image data comprising resolution conversion means for changing a resolution of the input image data to a reduced image (Abstract; Figure 1 , Reduced image 12); and display means for displaying the reduced image obtained by the resolution conversion means with a rectangle region extracted by the region extraction means (Abstract;

Figure 1, Rectangular Block 13; Column 2, Lines 63-68, Column 3, Lines 1-7).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined apparatus of Kamada et al, Kazuyuki et al and Wang et al. according to the teachings of Tabata et al to implement further limitations recited in claim 8 because it will provide efficient and economic interactive processing of a complex document (Tabata et al; Column 1, Lines 54-58).

7. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combined teachings of Kamada et al (U.S. 6,466,694), Kazuyuki et al (EP 0 587 450) and Wang et al. (U.S. 6,512,848) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Kodaira et al. (U.S. 6,043,823).

As to claim 9, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claim 9. Kamada et al. Kazuyuki et al. and Wang et al. do not explicitly disclose automatic modification means for automatic selection and modification of the selected regions.

Kodaira et al disclose a document processing system, which can automatically select and modify regions of a document (Column 2, Lines 26-41; Column 13, Lines 27-54).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined apparatus of Kamada et al, Kazuyuki et al and Wang et al. according to the teachings of Kodaira et al to perform automatic selection and modification of the selected regions because it will expedite document

modification process, minimize processing error and eliminate the burden of time-consuming manual modification by the user.

As to claim 10, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2 are applicable to claim 10.

As to claim 12, Kodaira et al further disclose, wherein the image input means converts the input image data to binary image data (Figure 3, Step ST301, Binarization Processing).

As to claim 13, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 12 are applicable to claim 13.

As to claim 15, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 9 are applicable to claim 15. Kamada et al further disclose image output means for outputting the modified image obtained by the document modification apparatus (Figure 3A, Displaying Unit 25).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2623

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samir A. Ahmed whose telephone number is (571) 272-7413. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on (571) 272-7414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Samir', is written over a long, thin horizontal line that extends across the width of the signature area.

**SAMIR AHMED
PRIMARY EXAMINER**